

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 20 2007

Serial No. 09/769,380

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-25 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, new claims 26-27 have been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-27 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview Of February 20, 2007

The Applicants would like to express gratitude to the Examiner for the interview granted on February 20, 2007. Portions of the arguments presented in that interview are included below in this Amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 5-1 on pages 2-5 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 8, 11, and 14-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar (<http://www.ceantar.org/dicts/search.html>, published April 1998) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,704,703, issued to Fenwick (hereinafter referred to as "Fenwick"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application recites a computer having a character input function, "wherein said issuing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets while characters of the input character string are being input until the input characters of the character string are defined." The Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, recites at least this feature of claim 1:

Ceantar merely checks boxes for selecting the type of dictionary, an input field for inputting the keyword, and a start button for instructing the start of the search. The Examiner acknowledged that Ceantar does not disclose the feature of claim 1 recited above, and the Applicants further submit that Ceantar does not contemplate the feature.

The Examiner stated, however, that Fenwick discloses a system in which an issuing section issues the search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword, with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets while characters of the input

Serial No. 09/769,380

character string are being input until the input characters of the character string are defined. The Examiner cited, as an example, Lines 15-20 of Column 2 of Fenwick, which describes determining if the entry of a particular item in a particular position matches a data word or data command stored in the dictionary.

This is in direct contrast, however, to the recited feature of issuing the search request for the dictionary data to a plurality of dictionaries. In other words, Fenwick, as described by the Examiner, only discloses checking the single dictionary for the spelling of the entered word. There is not suggestion of issuing the search request to a plurality of dictionaries. Also, this deficiency is not cured by any listing of multiple dictionaries in Ceantar, because there is no contemplation of issuing the search request to a plurality of dictionaries, as recited in claim 1, in either Ceantar or Fenwick.

Further, Fenwick merely discloses checking the spelling of the input word to see if there is a match in the dictionary, and therefore does not issue a search request for dictionary data specified by the entered word. In one example embodiment enabled by claim 1 of the present application, various dictionary searches may include Japanese-English dictionaries and science and technical term dictionaries. This is not possible with Fenwick, even combined with Ceantar.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least the feature of claim 1 recited above. For a proper §103 rejection, the cited references must disclose all of the features of the rejected claim. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine Ceantar and Fenwick. The Examiner stated that the motivation to combine the references would be to more quickly determine if an entered item is permissible when the character string is being entered in the search box of Ceantar. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that the very fact that Ceantar discloses searching a dictionary for an entered term teaches away from any "quick" determination of whether the word is permissible by some sort of spell check, as the word being looked up may not be part of the referenced spell-check dictionary.

Claim 2 of the present application depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 also patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Serial No. 09/769,380

Regarding claim 4, the Examiner did not even identify the recited feature, wherein "said starting section starts the program while characters of the input character string are being input until the input characters of the character string are defined, in either of the cited references. The Examiner apparently considered claim 4 to recite the same features as claim 1. However, while claim 1 is concerned with issuing the search request for the dictionary data with respect to a plurality of dictionaries, claim 4 is concerned with starting the program which is selected on the menu screen while specifying the keyword or an attribute value corresponding to the keyword as a parameter. Therefore, since the Examiner has not identified this feature in either of cited references, and since neither of the cited references disclose this feature, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 also patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Claims 8, 11, and 14-25 also recite similar features to those discussed in regard to claims 1 and/or 4. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8, 11, and 14-25 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In item 5-2 on pages 5-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar in view of Fenwick and further in view of Brown et al. (US 6665838, hereinafter referred to as "Brown").

As discussed previously in this Amendment, claims 4 and 8 patentably distinguish over Ceantar and Fenwick. Further, as Brown apparently merely discloses modifying a page to indicate the presence of user criteria on a linked page and sending the modified page to a client, Brown does not cure the deficiencies of Ceantar and Fenwick in regard to claims 4 and 8. Therefore, as claims 5 and 9 depend from claims 4 and 8, respectively, and include all of the features of those respective claims plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 9 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In item 5-3 on page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar in view of Fenwick and further in view of Brandt et al. (US 6377993, hereinafter referred to as "Brandt").

As discussed previously in this Amendment, claims 4 and 11 patentably distinguish over Ceantar and Fenwick. Further, as Brandt apparently merely discloses displaying that a program cannot be started if errors are found in the input, Brandt does not cure the deficiencies of Ceantar and Fenwick in regard to claims 4 and 11. Therefore, as claims 6 and 12 depend from claims 4 and 11, respectively, and include all of the features of those respective claims plus

Serial No. 09/769,380

additional features which are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 12 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In item 5-4 on page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 7, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceantar in view of Fenwick and further in view of Tran et al. (US 6157935, hereinafter referred to as "Tran").

As discussed previously in this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 8, and 11 patentably distinguish over Ceantar and Fenwick. Further, as Tran apparently merely discloses a stop button to cancel the loading of a page, Tran does not cure the deficiencies of Ceantar and Fenwick in regard to claims 1, 4, 8, and 11. Therefore, as claims 3, 7, 10, and 13 depend from claims 1, 4, 8, and 11, respectively, and include all of the features of those respective claims plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested in the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 7, 10, and 13 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

New Claims 26-27

New claim 26 is directed to issuing a search request to a plurality of dictionaries, and new claim 27 is directed to starting a program, both while characters are being entered into a word processing application. The Applicants respectfully submit that at least these features are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and therefore respectfully submit that new claims 26-27 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, new claims 26-27 have been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1- 27 are pending in the application and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

FEB. 20. 2007 5:10PM

STAAS & HALSEY -202-434-1501

NO. 5680 P. 17

Serial No. 09/769,380

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 02/20/07

By: Thomas L. Jones  
Thomas L. Jones  
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
on 02/20/2007  
by STAAS & HALSEY  
Date: 02/20/07